

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

4 Plaintiff,

5 vs.

6 DANIEL LUIS BOWLIN,

7 Defendant.

Case No.: 2:18-cr-00095-APG-NJK

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
CLARIFICATION

[ECF NO. 232]

9
10 Defendant Daniel Luis Bowlin filed a letter, which I am treating as a motion, seeking
11 clarification whether his sentence in this case runs concurrent to his state court sentence, or
12 whether he is entitled to credit for time in state custody. ECF No. 232. The Government
13 opposes. ECF No. 238.

14 Mr. Bowlin contends that it “was understood” by the parties that his sentence would run
15 concurrent to his state court sentence. ECF No. 232. But the plea agreement is silent on that
16 issue. ECF No. 102 at 7-8. And the issue of concurrent or consecutive time was not raised at Mr.
17 Bowlin’s sentencing hearing. *See* ECF No. 230. Thus, even if I have jurisdiction to address Mr.
18 Bowlin’s motion (which the Government contends I do not), I would not alter the judgment as
19 Mr. Bowlin requests. I will leave it to the Bureau of Prisons to decide whether to credit Mr.
20 Bowlin with time he served in state custody.

21 I HEREBY ORDER that Mr. Bowlin’s motion **(ECF No. 232) is DENIED.**

22 DATED: September 7, 2021.

23
24 

25 Andrew P. Gordon
26 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
27
28